



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/598,513

11/05/2007

Takao Ikuno

00862.108808.

6679

5514

7590

04/23/2012

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO

1290 Avenue of the Americas

NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800

EXAMINER

RUST, ERIC A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/23/2012

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/598,513	<b>Applicant(s)</b> IKUNO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ERIC A. RUST	<b>Art Unit</b> 2625	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2012.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on \_\_\_\_; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.
- 4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-7,10-13 and 16-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 5a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-7,10-13 and 16-19 is/are rejected.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 9) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 28, 2012 has been entered.

In the Amendment filed on March 28, 2012, Applicants amended claims 1, 7, and 13. Claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, and 16-19 are pending.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 4, and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,943,508 to Penney et al. (hereinafter, Penney) in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter, AAPA), in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,587,735 B1 to Yaguchi

Art Unit: 2625

**In regard to claims 1, 7, and 13**, Penney discloses an image processing apparatus (**Penney, Fig. 1, and col. 1, lines 49-52**) comprising:

a predetermined number of code converting units (**Penney, Fig. 1, item 14**), each code converting unit configured to execute coding and decoding of image data, wherein the predetermined number of code converting units includes reserved code converting units and non-reserved code converting units, such that the number of reserved code converting units is less than the number of all code converting units (**Penney, col. 2, lines 19-22, and 47-53**);

a plurality of request-source task units (**Penney, Fig. 1, item 11**), the number of request-source task units being greater than the number of code converting units (**Penney, col. 2, lines 13-15**) and having priorities set in advance (**Penney, col. 2, lines 47-53, one of the outputs of the input matrix is assigned to one of the input sources, the Examiner interprets this source as having a high priority with the other sources having lower priority**); wherein each request-source task unit having a high priority reserves one of the reserved code converting units and wherein each fixedly reserved code converting unit is not subsequently available for another request-source task unit (**Penney, col. 2, lines 47-53**), and wherein each request-source task unit having a low priority competes for at least one of the non-reserved code converting units (**Penney, Fig. 1, and col. 2, lines 47-57, one of item 14 is reserved, and there are more items 11 than there are items 14, accordingly, they would have to compete**), the number of non-reserved code converting units being less than the number of

Art Unit: 2625

request-source task units having the low priority (**Penney, Fig. 1, there are more items 11 than there are items 14**); and

an assigning unit (**Penney, Fig. 1, item 18**) configured to assign:

- i. when one of the plurality of request-source units having the high priority, the code converting unit reserved by the request-source task unit to a task corresponding to the request-source task unit (**Penney, col. 2, lines 47-57, resource manager 18 assures that one of the decoders I coupled to the output for a certain task**), and
- ii. when one of the plurality of request-source units having the low priority and one of the plurality of non-reserved code converting units is an idle code converting unit, the idle code converting unit to the task corresponding to the request-source task unit that issued the processing request (**Penney, col. 3, lines 13-16, and 46-52, assigned as needed**).

Penney does not disclose wherein the plurality of request-source task units are configured to issue a processing request.

AAPA, however, discloses code processing units being requested to execute processing (**AAPA, pg. 2, lines 9-14**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Penny with the teachings of AAPA for having the plurality of request-source task units issue the processing request in order to ensure data is processed when needed and when able. That is, the request would ensure that data is sent when the code converting units are available, and that data would not be

Art Unit: 2625

sent if the code converting units were not available. In this way, data would not be lost. This increases user satisfaction.

Neither Penney nor AAPA disclose the plurality of code converting units comprising at least one of a hardware-implemented code converting unit and a non-transitory computer-readable medium.

Yaguchi, however, discloses code converting units constituted by software-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by software and hardware-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by hardware (**Yaguchi, col. 18, lines 58-61**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Yaguchi with the teachings AAPA and Penney for having code converting units constituted by software-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by software and hardware-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by hardware; and said assigning unit assigns said software-implemented code converting units to the processing requests of the request-source task units in order to execute data at high speed and in order to select the optimum processor at processing time (**Yaguchi, col. 1, lines 54-63**).

**In regard to claim 4**, which depends from claim 1, neither Penney nor AAPA disclose wherein said predetermined code converting units constituted by software-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by software and hardware-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by

Art Unit: 2625

hardware, and when the processing request is received from one of the plurality of request-source units, said assigning unit assigns one of said software-implemented code converting units to the task according to the request-source task unit the issued the processing request.

Yaguchi, however, discloses wherein said predetermined code converting units constituted by software-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by software and hardware-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by hardware (**Yaguchi, col. 18, lines 58-61, and AAPA, pg. 2, lines 9-14**); and when the processing request is received from one of the plurality of request-source units, said assigning unit assigns one of said software-implemented code converting units to the task according to the request-source task unit the issued the processing request (**Yaguchi, col. 19, lines 32-34, and AAPA, pg. 2, lines 9-14**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Yaguchi with the teachings AAPA and Penney for having code converting units constituted by software-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by software and hardware-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by hardware; and said assigning unit assigns said software-implemented code converting units to the processing requests of the request-source task units in order to execute data at high speed and in order to select the optimum processor at processing time (**Yaguchi, col. 1, lines 54-63**).

Art Unit: 2625

**In regard to claim 18**, which depends from claim 1, AAPA and Penney disclose wherein when the processing request is received from one of the plurality of request-source task units having the low priority and none of the plurality of non-reserved code converting units is an idle code converting unit, the request-source task unit stands by, such that the assigning unit does not assign a code converting unit to the task corresponding to the request-source task unit until one of the plurality of non-reserved code converting units becomes an idle converting unit, regardless of whether one of the plurality of reserved code converting units is an idle code converting unit (**AAPA, pg. 2, lines 9-14, and Penney, Fig. 1, and col. 2, lines 47-57, one of item 14 is reserved, and there are more items 11 than there are items 14, accordingly, they would have to compete, if none of 14 are available, then 12 has to wait (i.e., be in an idle state))**).

**In regard to claim 19**, which depends from claim 1, AAPA and Penney disclose wherein each request-source task unit having a high priority reserves one of the reserved code converting units before issuing the processing request (**AAPA, pg. 2, lines 9-14, and Penney, Fig. 1, and col. 2, lines 47-57**).

4. Claims 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Penney in view of AAPA.



Art Unit: 2625

**In regard to claims 7 and 13**, Penney discloses an image processing method (**Penney, Fig. 1, and col. 1, lines 49-52**) comprising:

a plurality of request-source task units (**Penney, Fig. 1, item 11**), the number of which is greater than a predetermined number of code converting units (**Penney, col. 2, lines 13-15**) and having priorities corresponding to respective tasks, (**Penney, col. 2, lines 47-53, one of the outputs of the input matrix is assigned to one of the input sources, the Examiner interprets this source as having a high priority with the other sources having lower priority**);

a priority processing determination step of determining whether the request-source task unit should be processed with priority (**Penney, col. 2, lines 47-53**), wherein each request-source task unit having a high priority reserves one of the predetermined number of code converting units and wherein each fixedly reserved code converting unit is not subsequently available for another request-source task unit (**Penney, col. 2, lines 19-22, and 47-53**), and wherein each request-source task unit having a low priority competes for at least one of a plurality of non-reserved code converting units (**Penney, Fig. 1, and col. 2, lines 47-57, one of item 14 is reserved, and there are more items 11 than there are items 14, accordingly, they would have to compete**), the number of non-reserved code converting units being less than the number of request-source task units having the low priority (**Penney, Fig. 1, there are more items 11 than there are items 14**); and

an assigning step of assigning: i. when one of the plurality of request-source units having the high priority, the code converting unit reserved by the request-source

Art Unit: 2625

task unit to a task corresponding to the request-source task unit (**Penney, col. 2, lines 47-57, resource manager 18 assures that one of the decoders I coupled to the output for a certain task**), and

ii. when one of the plurality of request-source units having the low priority and one of the plurality of non-reserved code converting units is an idle code converting unit, the idle code converting unit to the task corresponding to the request-source task unit that issued the processing request (**Penney, col. 3, lines 13-16, and 46-52, assigned as needed**).

Penney does not disclose a processing-request issuing step of issuing a processing request to a code converting unit by any request-source task unit; receiving the processing request and determining if the processing request issued by the of request-source task should be issued with priority; and that the assigning step assigns code converting units to a processing request from one of said plurality of request-source task.

AAPA, however, discloses code processing units being requested to execute processing (**AAPA, pg. 2, lines 9-14**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Penny with the teachings of AAPA for a processing-request issuing step of issuing a processing request to a code converting unit by any request-source task unit; receiving the processing request and determining if the processing request issued by the of request- source task should be issued with priority; and that the assigning step assigns code converting units to a processing request from

Art Unit: 2625

one of said plurality of request-source task in order to ensure data is processed when needed and when able. That is, the request would ensure that data is sent when the code converting units are available, and that data would not be sent if the code converting units were not available. In this way, data would not be lost. This increases user satisfaction.

5. Claim 10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Penney and AAPA in view of Yaguchi.

**In regard to claims 10 and 16**, which depend from claims 7 and 13, respectively, neither AAPA nor Penney disclose wherein said predetermined number of code converting units are constituted by software-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by software and hardware-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by hardware; and

when the processing request is received from one of the plurality of request-source units said assigning step assigns one of said software-implemented code converting units to the task corresponding to the request-source task unit that issued the request.

Yaguchi, however, discloses code converting units constituted by software-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by software and hardware-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by hardware (**Yaguchi, col. 18, lines 58-61**); and said assigning unit assigns said

Art Unit: 2625

software-implemented code converting units to the request-source task units (**Yaguchi, col. 19, lines 32-34**).

Moreover, AAPA discloses code processing units being requested to execute processing (**AAPA, pg. 2, lines 9-14**). The combination would result in the limitations of claims 10 and 16.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Yaguchi with the teachings AAPA and Penney for having code converting units constituted by software-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by software and hardware-implemented code converting units for executing code conversion by hardware; and said assigning unit assigns said software-implemented code converting units to the processing requests of the request-source task units in order to execute data at high speed and in order to select the optimum processor at processing time (**Yaguchi, col. 1, lines 54-63**).

6. Claims 5-6, 11-12, and 17 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Penney, AAPA, and Yaguchi, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0047666 A1 to Mitchell et al. (hereinafter, Mitchell).

**In regard to claims 5, 11, and 17**, which depend from claims 4, 10, and 16, respectively, Penney discloses wherein said request-source task units having the high priority are classified into a first unit group processed and a second unit group (**Penney, col. 2, lines 62-64, the “advance assignment”**).

Art Unit: 2625

Moreover, Yaguchi discloses a first unit group being processed by software-implemented code converting units (**Yaguchi, col. 18, line 58 - col. 19, line 36, the first group is processing that requires more than a predetermined time, see specifically, Yaguchi, col. 19, lines 21-26, and lines 27-34**) and a second unit group processed by hardware-implemented code converting units (**Yaguchi, col. 18, line 58 - col. 19, line 36, the second group is processing that requires less than a predetermined time, see specifically, Yaguchi, col. 19, lines 21-26**).

Neither Yaguchi, AAPA, nor Penney specifically disclose the second unit group processed by said hardware-implemented code converting units via said software-implemented code converting units.

Mitchell, however, discloses tasks being processed by hardware-implemented code converting units via software-implemented code converting units (**Mitchell, Abstract, lines 9-13**).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Mitchell with the teachings of Yaguchi, AAPA, and Penney for having tasks being processed by hardware-implemented code converting units via software-implemented code converting units in order to prepare data for non-compliant hardware decoders (**Mitchell, Abstract, lines 11-13**).

**In regard to claims 6 and 12**, which depend from claims 5 and 11, respectively, Yaguchi discloses wherein said hardware-implemented code converting units are adapted so as to be used by the request-source task units of said second unit group

Art Unit: 2625

**(Yaguchi, col. 19, lines 21-26, processing that requires less than a predetermined time is processed by hardware, accordingly, said hardware-implemented code converting units are adapted so as to be used by the request-source task units of said second unit group).**

### ***Response to Arguments***

7. In the Remarks section of the Amendment, no specific argument was made in regard to why the Amendments overcome the current rejection. However, the Examiner believes that once a unit is reserved, it would not subsequently be available, at least for short period of time. the Examiner suggests Applicant amend the claims to recite that "wherein each fixedly reserved code converting unit is ~~[[not]]~~ never subsequently available for another request-source task unit."

### ***Conclusion***

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ERIC A. RUST whose telephone number is (571)-270-3380. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Benny Tieu can be reached on (571)-272-7490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-270-4380.

Art Unit: 2625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ERIC A. RUST/

Examiner, Art Unit 2625

04/19/2012